



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,802	09/22/2005	Keiichiro Suzuki	09450/0203332-US0	3960
7278	7590	03/16/2009	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770			AMIRI, NAHID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3679	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***

**Application No.**

10/550,802

**Examiner**

NAHID AMIRI

**Applicant(s)**

SUZUKI ET AL.

**Art Unit**

3679

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 27 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-9

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
 See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Daniel P. Stodola/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3679

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to claim 1, Applicants argue that the claim recites that both the first and second lip portions protrude from an outer circumferential surface of the elastic dust cover to make contact with the brim portion. Further, Applicants allege that Pazdirek discloses only the inner sealing surface of boot 20 makes lateral contact with the integral raised annular flange; wherein the annular ridge 92 is part of inner sealing surface 86 of boot 20, makes contact with the flange 52 at groove 72 and outer sealing surface 88 of boot 20 makes no contact at all with the integral raised annular flange 52. Finally, Applicants argue that the second lip portion of Pazdirek is not "tilted gradually". This is not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the reference does not include certain features of Applicant's invention, the limitations on which the Applicant relies (i.e., the first and second lip portions making contact with the brim portion) clearly are not stated in the claims. Therefore, it is of little consequence whether the reference includes those features or not since one cannot rely on the specification to impart to the claims limitations otherwise not recited therein. Further, it is should be noted that the claims do not indicate relative to what element the second lip portion is "tilted gradually". Accordingly, as stated in previous Office action, Pazdirek discloses (Fig. 9) all the structural limitations of Applicants' invention within the language of the claims. Further still, the second lip (L2) of Pazdirek is "tilted gradually" as much as the second lip of Applicants' invention is.

With respect to claims 4 and 6-8, Applicants argue that the claims are allowable because of their dependency from base claim 1. This is acknowledged. However, in view of the fact that claim 1 is considered to be properly rejected, Claims 4 and 6-8 are also properly rejected since they are depending from rejected base claim 1.